UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MCALLEN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CASE NO: 7:13-CR-1154-12
Plaintiff,)	CRIMINAL
vs.)	McAllen, Texas
TOCK A DARTITA)	Thursday, November 13, 2014
JOSE A. PADILLA,)	(10:55 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.) (11:30 a.m. to 11:53 a.m.)
Defendant.)	(11:59 a.m. to 12:05 p.m.)

SENTENCING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE RANDY CRANE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

(SEALED BENCH CONFERENCE OMITTED)

Interpreter: Elena Medrano

Court Recorder: Rick Rodriguez

Transcribed by: Exceptional Reporting Services, Inc.

P.O. Box 18668

Corpus Christi, TX 78480-8668

361 949-2988

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

2 **APPEARANCES:** For Plaintiff: JAMES H. STURGIS, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorney 1701 W. Business Hwy. 83 Suite 600 McAllen, TX 78501 For Defendant: DENNIS RAMIREZ, ESQ. 111 N. Seventeenth Street Suite D Donna, TX 78537 U.S. Probation Office: N. Canales 1701 W. Business Hwy. 83 Suite 729 McAllen, TX 78501

```
5
 1
              THE COURT: I think it -- pressing is just -- it
 2
    pertains to even low level law enforcement officers, a --
              MR. RAMIREZ: We'll concede to that, your Honor.
 3
 4
              THE COURT: -- patrol officer. So it applies to
 5
    that.
              And then abuse of position of trust. I mean that's a
 6
 7
    pretty obvious two-level enhancement as well.
 8
              And the obstruction that he got probably --
 9
              MR. RAMIREZ: We do have an issue with the
10
    obstruction, Judge.
11
              THE COURT: Right. And I looked at this issue
12
    overnight. It was brought to my attention yesterday by
13
    yourself and the Government. It did not appear as though it
14
    should be assessed here.
15
              Does the Government have any more thoughts on that?
    It seemed like there was --
16
17
              MR. STURGIS: The Government agrees that it should
18
    not be assessed because it's not --
19
              THE COURT: The instant offense, right.
20
              MR. STURGIS: -- (indiscernible) this prosecution.
21
              THE COURT: Nor did it actually impede this
22
    particular case, whatever, and it's sort of a circuitous
23
    argument that his taking bribes obstructed justice, which he
24
    was being paid to look the other way or to assist, but that's
25
    what he's being punished for, so it seemed also somewhat of a
```

```
7
1
    from Mr. Ouintanilla, came from Mr. Gonzalez as well.
 2
    actually went from Mr. Gonzalez to Mr. Treviño, with
    Mr. Quintanilla being there for intermediary (indiscernible).
 3
    Mr. Padilla was not involved with that (indiscernible) --
 4
 5
              THE COURT: With that at all.
              MR. STURGIS: -- Mr. Gonzalez'.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: All right. So then let's go with the
    first item. It is a $40,000 payment. And these are
 8
 9
    allegations that were --
10
              MR. QUINTANILLA: Your Honor --
11
              THE COURT: -- made.
12
              MR. QUINTANILLA: -- may I interrupt real quickly?
13
              THE COURT: Uh-huh.
14
              MR. QUINTANILLA: I know it's -- it may involve Mr.
15
    Gonzalez and he needs an interpreter. He has the --
16
              THE COURT: He's not wearing --
17
              MR. QUINTANILLA: Is this being interpreted, your
18
    Honor?
19
              THE COURT: He understands some English, doesn't he,
20
    as well? I mean he graduated from Weslaco High School.
              MR. QUINTANILLA: I don't think he graduated.
21
22
              MR. STURGIS: He didn't graduate, your Honor, but I
    think --
23
24
              MR. QUINTANILLA: He's always used an interpreter.
25
              THE COURT:
                          All right.
                                      Well --
```

```
8
 1
              MR. QUINTANILLA: I just noticed right now that he
 2
    didn't have those on.
              THE COURT: He went first through tenth or eleventh
 3
    grade here in the United States. He understands some English,
 4
    no doubt. But now he has the interpreting on. I don't know if
 5
    these directly deal with him, other than he can dispute or
 6
 7
    corroborate some of this.
 8
              MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, if it comes up, I just
 9
    thought --
10
              THE COURT: It may. And is the agent on this case
11
    here? I don't see -- Reneau (phonetic)?
12
              MR. STURGIS: There are several agents here,
13
    your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: There are, okay.
15
              MR. STURGIS: He cut his hair.
16
              THE COURT: That happens when you get married.
17
              All right. So -- okay, so let's talk about the first
18
          It's in no particular order, this is just the order that
19
    they were in the Presentence Report. Allegedly Sheriff Treviño
20
    was going to take a vacation in Las Vegas and he hits up the
21
    Defendant, Mr. Gonzalez, for some money and so $40,000
22
    allegedly is given to Mr. Padilla to give to Mr. Treviño. And
23
    I don't know that we have much information on it, other than a
    debrief from whom?
24
25
              MR. STURGIS:
                            Judge, if we -- (indiscernible) and
```

```
9
 1
    some of this probably could be just done through proffer.
 2
    don't think that --
 3
              THE COURT:
                         Sure.
              MR. STURGIS: -- Mr. Padilla would have exception to
 4
 5
    most of this.
 6
              Mr. Gonzalez has stated that he did give that money.
    Mr. Padilla has informed us that he did receive some money from
 7
 8
    Mr. Gonzalez in reference to Mr. Treviño taking trips. And --
 9
              THE COURT: This would be the Las Vegas --
10
              MR. STURGIS: -- I believe Mr. Padilla --
11
              THE COURT: -- and Colorado trips now we're talking
12
    about?
13
              MR. STURGIS: Well, I believe that Mr. Padilla would
14
    agree that there's two sets of money transactions that refer to
15
    trips, per se.
16
              THE COURT: Okay, what are those?
17
              MR. STURGIS: There were some times where -- a couple
18
    of times where Mr. Gonzalez states that he had a discussion
19
    about trips and that he believes that he gave money to
20
    Mr. Padilla to give to Mr. Treviño for trips. Mr. Padilla has
21
    stated that some of that money was given. There was also times
22
    where Mr. Padilla would have another deputy act as if he was
23
    the Sheriff and state that they wanted to get some money to on
24
    a trip when in fact Mr. Padilla would get the money --
25
              THE COURT:
                          And keep it.
```

much of those. Mr. Gonzalez provided figures that he says he

25

- 1 | that he would have connections to be able to help with the
- 2 | marijuana and the arrest of his nephew. Obviously, that is not
- 3 correct. Mr. Davila had no connection as far as employment
- 4 | with the Sheriff's Office.
- 5 It was at that time that Mr. Davila begins receiving
- 6 monies from Mr. Gonzalez for Mr. Treviño's campaign. Some of
- 7 | those monies, according to Mr. Davila and Mr. Gonzalez and
- 8 Ms. Palacios (phonetic), were given straight to
- 9 | Sheriff Treviño --
- 10 **THE COURT:** Right.
- 11 MR. STURGIS: -- from Mr. Davila. Other monies, and
- 12 Mr. Padilla has confirmed this, were given to Mr. Padilla from
- 13 Mr. Davila, so Mr. Gonzalez to Mr. Davila to Mr. Padilla, to
- 14 give for the campaign.
- 15 THE COURT: Okay, but who involved Mr. Padilla in
- 16 | that? Did Treviño say --
- 17 MR. STURGIS: We haven't got there. Shortly after
- 18 | that stage is where Mr. Treviño decides that he wants
- 19 Mr. Davila to be out of the picture and then has Mr. Davila
- 20 introduce Mr. Padilla to Mr. Gonzalez so that he is the conduit
- 21 | instead of Mr. Davila, takes a peg out, if you will.
- 22 **THE COURT:** All right, so --
- 23 MR. STURGIS: From that beginning, your Honor, is
- 24 | where Mr. Padilla is involved --
- 25 **THE COURT:** Okay.

```
14
 1
              MR. STURGIS: -- with Mr. Gonzalez.
 2
              THE COURT: And this happens -- so the Sheriff
    substitutes Mr. Padilla for Mr. Davila because he doesn't trust
 3
 4
    Mr. Davila, or whatever, and this happens after the incident
 5
    at -- the seizure of --
 6
              MR. STURGIS: Correct.
 7
              THE COURT: -- the marijuana load --
              MR. STURGIS: The seizure is in March of 2011.
 9
    Mr. Padilla is introduced roughly probably sometime May/June of
10
    2011, May or June of 2011 to Mr. Gonzalez.
11
              MR. RAMIREZ: That's correct, Judge.
12
              THE COURT: All right.
13
              MR. RAMIREZ: And that's where we can date
    Mr. Padilla's contact.
14
              THE COURT: All right, so the Sheriff, what, orders,
15
16
    instructs Mr. Padilla go meet with Mr. Gonzalez or how does
17
    that --
18
              MR. STURGIS: According to Mr. Padilla and
19
    Mr. Davila.
20
              THE COURT: We're all in the Weslaco area, though.
                                                                   I
21
    mean he probably knew him, knew of him, I mean the arrest --
22
    no? So Mr. Treviño says I want you to go meet this special
23
    friend of mine? How does that work?
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Well, it was through Julio Davila --
25
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
```

```
16
1
    then another batch was then printed up or --
 2
              MR. STURGIS:
                            Correct.
 3
              THE COURT: Okay. And again, this is now middle of
    2011?
 4
              MR. STURGIS: This is, yes, close to the middle of
 5
    2011.
 6
 7
              MR. RAMIREZ: And this --
              MR. STURGIS: I think the way to date it was emails
 9
    from Mr. Treviño to the person making the signs. Those are
10
    dated late May of 2011. So at that point Mr. Pa -- excuse
11
    me -- Mr. Treviño was aware that this person is making signs on
12
    his behalf. Mr. Padilla then becomes a conduit some way with
13
    that, because Mr. Gonzalez is paying for the signs.
14
              THE COURT: All right. I need to take about a five-
15
    minute rest break. But I also diagramed all of this and I left
    it on my desk, so let me -- let's take about a ten-minute
16
17
    recess and then we'll pick right back up.
18
         (A recess was taken from 11:10 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.; parties
19
    present)
20
              THE COURT: Okay, so Mr. Sturgis, you had the floor.
21
    You were about to explain to me some connections. And I
22
    actually have a diagram to help me understand.
23
         (Pause)
              You can look at the monitor or you can look there.
24
25
         (Pause)
```

- 1 how obvious the property may be involved in narcotics
- 2 | trafficking, Mr. Treviño allegedly received some indication
- 3 | that it was apparent that it didn't seem right that
- 4 Mr. Gonzalez, who was -- appeared to be involved in narcotics
- 5 traffic and money laundering, had all this support from
- 6 Mr. Treviño. So Mr. Treviño apparently felt some heat from the
- 7 | fact that Mr. Gonzalez was advertising his connection to
- 8 Mr. Treviño. That, in connection with Mr. Treviño wanting to
- 9 remove Mr. Davila out of the picture, per se, at the behest of
- 10 Mr. Treviño, Mr. Padilla went over to Mr. Davila's location at
- 11 his house, saw the signs, and then Mr. Davila introduced
- 12 Mr. Padilla directly to Mr. Gonzalez for the purpose of being a
- 13 | conduit to have Mr. Gonzalez deliver his money to the Sheriff.
- 14 THE COURT: All right. And so you knew Mr. Davila
- 15 previously because he hosts parties, pachangas, for political
- 16 candidates and you've been probably to one of these parties,
- 17 just met him through the political process of campaigning,
- 18 right?
- 19 **THE DEFENDANT:** Yes, your Honor.
- 20 **THE COURT:** And I know he's in the bail bonds
- 21 | business. I don't know if you deal directly with people like
- 22 | that, but I assume on occasion you did as well? You'd have
- 23 | dealt with him on a professional basis, not just socially, as
- 24 | well?
- 25 **THE DEFENDANT:** Yes, sir.

- 1 THE COURT: And did you know also his -- I want to 2 say Arnulfo Davila, his brother?
- 3 **THE DEFENDANT:** Yes, your Honor.
- 4 THE COURT: Who worked, I guess, in the same
- 5 business?

9

11

6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

right-hand man of Julio Davila?

- 7 THE COURT: Worked for him? And was he also involved 8 with El Gallo and the Sheriff, Arnulfo, or just sort of the
- 10 MR. STURGIS: He was very verbally involved, but he
- directly involved as far as any of the decision making or what

was more running errands to get money at times. He was not

- 13 to do. He would just do as Mr. Julio Davila asked him to do
- 14 | instead of himself going over.
- 15 THE COURT: All right. So for about six months,
- 16 Mr. Treviño dealt with El Gallo through either Quintanilla or
- 17 Davila and then Padilla took over as the intermediary.
- 18 MR. STURGIS: Yes, probably in the neighborhood of
- 19 | four to five months. As I was saying, there were emails that
- 20 | were obtained from Mr. Treviño's email to the person making the
- 21 | signs. That was after Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Quintanilla, and
- 22 | Treviño met where Mr. Gonzalez says that he provided the
- 23 | 100,000 and the 50,000. That's the initial. Then there is the
- 24 introduction of Mr. Davila. Mr. Davila being the conduit to
- 25 Mr. Gonzalez. Then the introduction of Mr. Padilla.

```
1
              Mr. Padilla was involved at the same time -- became
 2
    involved at the same time the signs were being made, a batch of
    signs were being made. As he stated, he observed the first
 3
    signs that were no good and then he became involved about the
 4
 5
    time that the second set of them being made. Emails from
 6
    Mr. Treviño to the person making the signs involved a second
 7
    batch of signs. That's in late May. So you can pretty much
 8
    estimate that Mr. Padilla became involved with Mr. Gonzalez
 9
    sometime in the May area, middle May through June.
10
              THE COURT: All right. And so then the initial money
11
    was campaign related and then it became trips also?
12
              MR. STURGIS: The initial money, as I understand from
13
    Mr. Padilla and Mr. Gonzalez, started out -- the first time
14
    Mr. Padilla went, it was a small amount, a couple of thousand
15
    dollars. And then at that point it just started to evolve into
16
    bigger amounts.
17
              THE COURT: But, see, that's what I don't understand.
18
    If Davila had already paid the Sheriff $150,000 --
19
              MR. STURGIS: No, Mr. Davila wasn't involved in
20
    that --
21
              THE COURT:
                         I'm sorry. I'm sorry. If Mr. -- I'm
22
    sorry, I'm pointing to Gonzalez -- Mr. Gonzalez had already
23
    paid Mr. Treviño $150,000 in two transactions, one of a
24
    hundred, one of fifty, why is he now giving him $2,000?
25
              MR. STURGIS:
                            Because, as everybody's saying, this is
```

25

1 money myself.

THE COURT: And was there always kind of a reason for money? I mean it wasn't just for protection, it was always sort of a we need this for buying fajitas for a barbeque or we need this for a hole sponsorship for the golf course? Was there always some kind of a ruse for --

MR. STURGIS: Not all the time, but a number of the times. I believe the estimates that Mr. Gonzalez and Mr. Padilla have provided the Government is that they believe Mr. Gonzalez gave somewhere in the neighborhood of \$70,000 for the golf tournament that was held at Tierra Santa (phonetic).

THE COURT: And one time or --

MR. STURGIS: In pieces.

THE COURT: In pieces. In pieces, okay.

MR. RAMIREZ: And this coincides with the fundraising activity, your Honor, for the Sheriff's campaign for the 2012

March primary, the Democratic primary, which the fundraising starts June 2011.

What you see in June of 2011, when Mr. Padilla first met Mr. Gonzalez, is immediately there was a skeet shoot and what you have is following the skeet shoot in November you have the golf tournament at Tierra Santa. So this is --

THE COURT: That's November?

MR. RAMIREZ: November 2011. So when Mr. Padilla would make his trips to go visit Mr. Gonzalez it was under the

- guise that it was a campaign contribution. And the culture of the Sheriff's Office was 24 hours a day, 365 days a year we were fundraising, regardless of how much I spent on my last campaign, regardless of how much I had in my war chest, we're campaigning, guys, and we need to hit the streets, pound the pavement, and we need to have good contacts on people who are willing to pay for these fundraisers and for my campaign. That Democratic primary of 2012 was when Mr. Lupe Treviño was being challenged by Mr. Caples.

 THE COURT: And there was another gentleman.

 MR. RAMIREZ: It was Mr. Hernandez was in the primary
- 13 (Voices overlap)

individual elections.

THE COURT: Okay, so, again, it's this pressure to fundraise at all costs, whatever, legal, illegal, it didn't matter where the money was coming from, that began this scheme. But then it evolved then into, well, not only for the campaign, but I want to take a trip to Las Vegas, I want to take a trip to Colorado, and I need money for that?

MR. STURGIS: That's the information that has been provided.

THE COURT: That's sort of what it evolved to? Was that sort of in the middle of this time? When were those trips?

THE DEFENDANT: During the same time period.

THE COURT: During the same time period?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And then we've heard a lot of information about the boat. I've hear about it at least in one trial, maybe two trials, and then it's come up here because --

MR. STURGIS: The information about the boat, your Honor, is that Mr. Treviño made it known that he wanted to get a boat or fix up a boat and make it new essentially. In essence, he did buy a boat and did buy a motor for it. That's accounted. He sold that. But according to Mr. Gonzalez, the \$50,000 that was accepted directly -- or direct transaction to Mr. Treviño, Mr. Treviño showed up and informed Mr. Gonzalez that he wanted to get a boat and he was looking at this boat, so Mr. Gonzalez retrieved \$50,000 and said, here, will this cover it essentially. At the same time information coming from Mr. Padilla and the other deputies is Mr. Treviño was over at the Sheriff's Office telling people he wanted a boat, implying for them to go get money brought in for the boat.

THE COURT: Right, because Fernando Guerra Sr.

(phonetic) says he gave money for a boat. I think he said

6,000. And then J.P. Flores (phonetic) also testified that he had to go and ask people for money for the Sheriff's boat and he talked about delivering that money in cash to your office, actually, and he had an envelope that said, whatever, the Sheriff's Boat Fund or something, and that that was going to be

- 1 | thousand dollar boat and he writes a check for 50,000 and cash
- 2 | just paid for remainder or how --
- 3 MR. STURGIS: No, the boat was -- the boat total
- 4 | was -- the boat and motor total was somewhere in the
- 5 neighborhood of about 30,000.
- 6 THE COURT: Was that the actual value of the boat or
- 7 | is this one of these deals where the boat's really worth 50,
- 8 I'm going to write you a check for 30 and then here's the other
- 9 20?
- 10 MR. STURGIS: No, that's pretty close to the
- 11 |actual --
- 12 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 13 | MR. STURGIS: -- amount of the boat. The boat owner
- 14 says that it's been sold now.
- 15 **THE COURT:** All right. All right, so we digressed a
- 16 | little bit. Well, not actually. We're still -- I think I
- 17 understand now the connection there.
- 18 So about half the money that comes through for the
- 19 | Sheriff then you begin keeping for your own personal use or is
- 20 half you're keeping for your personal use and for campaign
- 21 expenses? That's what I didn't really understand.
- 22 **THE DEFENDANT:** Well, it's for both really,
- 23 your Honor.
- 24 THE COURT: Because obviously if 60,000 comes in for
- 25 | the skeet shoot or 70,000 comes in for the golf tournament,

- 1 | there are actual expenses for the golf tournament. And so do
- 2 | you actually use all of that, none of that, some of that for
- 3 | the golf tournament?
- 4 THE DEFENDANT: Well, that's just it, the Sheriff
- 5 | wanted all the donations, even collected for the campaign
- 6 | fundraisers, to go directly to him. We had to find a way to
- 7 pay for the expenses ourselves. He didn't want to use none of
- 8 that money that --
- 9 **THE COURT:** None of the cash even?
- 10 **THE DEFENDANT:** -- was for --
- 11 MR. STURGIS: According to Mr. Padilla, it was as if
- 12 he was double dipping. When he had the golf tournament, per
- 13 | se, all the teams that signed up or paid an entry fee, so they
- 14 | had that thing for a lot of the -- the golf course, the food,
- 15 that kind of stuff, that's what the entry fee is for to cover.
- 16 At the same time you have fundraising going on the side, in
- 17 | this case Mr. Padilla getting monies out of Mr. Gonzalez, that
- 18 money is also provided. So you have payment on this side for
- 19 it, but you're also taking in money over here, so you're always
- 20 going to have a windfall of a lot of money coming off of --
- 21 **THE COURT:** But I don't understand how the expenses
- 22 then paid for. If you have revenues, legitimate documented
- 23 revenues, team fees --
- MR. STURGIS: Correct, that pays for the --
- 25 THE COURT: -- and you have what I'm going to call as

- 1 | you all need to figure out how to have that money. So where
- 2 | this evolved from was the money was being kept in order to
- 3 | cover some of those expenses and it evolved into something a
- 4 little different later on in time.
- 5 THE COURT: All right. Okay, so that's the campaign
- 6 money, that's the trip money, then there was some money you
- 7 | asked Mr. Gonzalez for to pay for Jonathan Treviño's lawyer?
- 8 Yes? No?
- 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I did ask him,
- 10 | but --
- 11 THE COURT: Who put you up to that or did you do it
- 12 on your own?
- 13 **THE DEFENDANT:** I had to come up with ways to get
- 14 | more money out of him. After I already collected or solicited
- 15 money for a certain fundraiser he already had given me, I had
- 16 to get more.
- 17 **THE COURT:** Ah, so this was a ruse. You said, hey,
- 18 | we need money for his --
- 19 **THE DEFENDANT:** I had to turn in money weekly to the
- 20 Sheriff.
- 21 | THE COURT: Okay. Okay. That's right, so that money
- 22 | didn't actually go to his lawyer, but that's the -- sort of the
- 23 ruse in order to come up with money you had to give the
- 24 Sheriff.
- 25 **THE DEFENDANT:** Yes, your Honor.

a situation where the directive from the Sheriff to Mr. Padilla

25

- 1 was such that I don't want any checks, I want cash.
- 2 THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Sturgis, what -- this
- 3 | is the last issue on Mr. Padilla, dollar amounts. We think
- 4 that it's -- the actual amount is between 120 and 200 that he
- 5 benefited?
- 6 MR. STURGIS: That he benefited or that he received?
- 7 THE COURT: Well, we can talk about either.
- 8 MR. STURGIS: I don't think there's any doubt --
- 9 **THE COURT:** Or both.
- 10 MR. STURGIS: -- even by his own calculation, what he
- 11 | received from Mr. Gonzalez would be in the 120 to 200.
- 12 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 13 MR. STURGIS: I think, based on Mr. Padilla's
- 14 | statements, that what he kept personally would have been
- 15 | between 70 and 120.
- 16 **THE COURT:** All right.
- 17 MR. STURGIS: This seems somewhat corroborated in
- 18 that, not including the initial 150.
- 19 **THE COURT:** Right, yeah, because Mr. Quintanilla had
- 20 to do with that. He had nothing to do with that. And Davila
- 21 maybe had to do with that.
- 22 MR. STURGIS: No, Mr. Davila did not, but --
- 23 **THE COURT:** Okay, Quintanilla.
- 24 MR. STURGIS: But if you take that amount out, then
- 25 | based on Mr. Gonzalez's estimates, he didn't keep detailed

- 1 | reports of it, but based on his estimates he says that he
- 2 | thinks he gave somewhere in total, including the 150, between
- 3 400 and 500,000.
- 4 THE COURT: So if you back out the 150 --
- 5 MR. STURGIS: So you back out the 150, if you take it
- 6 off of the low-end, 400, you're saying that 250,000 that would
- 7 have involved either Mr. Davila or Mr. Padilla.
- 8 THE COURT: All right.
- 9 MR. STURGIS: So you're on the cusp. You're right on
- 10 | the --
- 11 THE COURT: But some of this money went straight to
- 12 Davila to Treviño and didn't include Mr. Padilla. I mean we
- 13 | can recall --
- MR. STURGIS: Some of it went to Mr. Davila to
- 15 Mr. Padilla to the Sheriff. He was just another step in the
- 16 money transfer at that point. Based on Mr. Padilla's
- 17 | statements, when it was going from Mr. Gonzalez initially to
- 18 Mr. Davila to Mr. Padilla to the Sheriff, Mr. Padilla didn't
- 19 keep any of that money. It wasn't until he was dealing
- 20 directly with Mr. Gonzalez.
- 21 So the Court's first question it appears would be is,
- 22 | if you took the cumulative off of what he kept and what was
- 23 given to the Sheriff in some form or fashion coming from Mr.
- 24 | Gonzalez, you're right on the cusp of 200,000, which would be
- 25 | the guideline of which way you go. Based on what he kept and

- 1 what the Government's aware of, if the Court's looking at that,
- 2 you're in the 70 to 120.
- 3 THE COURT: All right, so -- and the -- I don't know
- 4 | if it's coincidence, but that's -- the relevant conduct that
- 5 the Sheriff was held to on his case was about a hundred
- 6 thousand?
- 7 MR. STURGIS: Correct, 70 to 120 range, based on
- 8 | that's the money that he says he got.
- 9 **THE COURT:** He got.
- 10 MR. STURGIS: The Court was aware of the 150, but I
- 11 | don't believe took that into account on his guideline
- 12 | calculations.
- 13 **THE COURT:** Okay.
- 14 MR. STURGIS: Again, that wouldn't involve
- 15 Mr. Padilla, that would --
- 16 THE COURT: No.
- 17 MR. STURGIS: -- involve Mr. Quintanilla.
- 18 THE COURT: But so in other words, this would be
- 19 | consistent with the other Court's finding of Mr. Padilla
- 20 keeping about a hundred thousand, because the Sheriff also kept
- 21 about a hundred thousand, and you're saying basically about
- 22 | fifty/fifty, about half the money made it all the way and the
- 23 other half of the money stayed with Mr. Padilla. Is that --
- MR. RAMIREZ: That's accurate, your Honor. I think
- 25 | the amount of money that Mr. Padilla kept is in the

- 1 neighborhood of that range of 70 to 120. To narrow it down,
- 2 | we'd say 90 to a hundred.
- I will offer to the Court that Mr. Padilla
- 4 | voluntarily returned 30,000 of that during the time he was
- 5 | cooperating with the Government.
- 6 THE COURT: All right. So that's a plus eight. Let
- 7 me see what that does then.
- 8 Twenty-seven after acceptance? Is that what you all
- 9 come up with?
- 10 MR. RAMIREZ: That's correct, Judge.
- 11 **THE COURT:** Ms. Canales, you got that also?
- 12 **PROBATION OFFICER CANALES:** Yes, your Honor.
- 13 **THE COURT:** Twenty-seven, and no criminal history.
- 14 | So your range is 70 to 87 months. But you cooperated with the
- 15 Government, testified in at least one trial, so let's take up
- 16 | the issue of the sealed motion.
- 17 You want to approach the bench on that?
- 18 MR. STURGIS: Yes, your Honor.
- 19 (Sealed bench conference from 11:53 a.m. to 11:59 a.m.
- 20 omitted)
- 21 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Padilla, you get to speak
- 22 | as well before I sentence you. It's your right to do so. You
- 23 don't have to say anything, but if you'd like for me to
- 24 | consider anything more now is your chance to speak.
- 25 **THE DEFENDANT:** I prepared a brief statement, if it's

1 okay, your Honor.

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 **THE COURT:** Absolutely.

THE DEFENDANT: As a former leader of the Hidalgo

County Sheriff's Office --

THE COURT: Speak up a little bit.

THE DEFENDANT: As a former leader of the Hidalgo County Sheriff's Office, it was not my intention to cause hurt or disappoint to my family, the community, or fellow law enforcement officers. In retrospect, I know the situation that I currently in -- I'm currently in resulted from the inexcusable lack in judgment and moral behavior on my . it is by no means an excuse for my behavior, knowing the cause will help me guard against future mistakes. While it was an embarrassing and life altering experience, it is an experience I intend to learn from. Aside from my family, I lost the one thing that I live for, my job. By the same token, I lost the trust of lawmen in the community. I understand that my behavior was unethical. This has taught me that the consequences are not worth the legal ramifications. So again, I am deeply sorry.

THE COURT: All right. It does seem that there was no moral compass at the Sheriff's Office and I believe that that was driven from the top down. And you were in a situation where it's hard to resist the demands of the Sheriff, your employer, your boss, and that's what initially got you into

1 this.

There are a couple of things that benefit you. One is that you accepted your responsibility early in this case and agreed to testify in a trial, which you did. You also voluntarily testified at a sentencing hearing. And were working at the behest of the Sheriff, who I believe deserves the larger sentence.

Although your guideline range came out to more, it's because of what you pled to, what you didn't. That other Judge didn't consider additional conduct, for whatever reason. And so you're going to end up with a lesser sentence than him today, which I believe is appropriate, given what all you've done.

I know this has been a lesson to you and that this isn't the kind of conduct you will engage in again. You're going to be on supervised release for a number of years when you get out of prison. I hope you'll spend your time in prison productively and then when you get out perhaps this experience will be something that you can share with others so that they avoid making these terrible mistakes that you've made in life.

And the fact that you returned 30,000 of the 90,000 that you had obtained is also a benefit to you. No one else has returned any money. So I'm considering that in assessing the appropriate sentence for you.

Does the Government have anything more they wanted to

1 add?

2 MR. STURGIS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And again, we've met on this case numerous times and I'm aware of the Government's position.

All right, so the Court adopts the factual findings contained within the Presentence Report. As I mentioned, this results in a Total Offense Level of 27 after making the findings that I mentioned earlier. However, I grant the Government's sealed motion and therefore, pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it's the judgment of the Court the Defendant, Mr. Padilla, is committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 38 months.

I'm going to place him on supervision for three years. While on supervision he is not to commit another federal, state, or local crime, he's to comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this Court, abide by any mandatory conditions required by law, and in addition not to possess a firearm or other destructive device, and to cooperate in providing a DNA sample.

I find Mr. Padilla cannot afford to pay a fine, so I it, but he is assessed a \$100 special assessment, which is payable immediately.

And, Mr. Padilla, you can appeal. You'd have two weeks to do so. If you could not afford the cost of an appeal, you could ask that I waive these costs of an appeal.

1 And your sentence, while it's significant, it is also 2 a significant departure from your quideline range and it is because I am convinced that but for your cooperation with the 3 Government that the conviction of Sheriff Treviño would not 4 5 have occurred in the manner and quickness that it did and that 6 it was your decision to assist the Government in specifically 7 the Sheriff's case that I think merits your reward, and so to some extent you are to be thanked for making that decision. 8 9 Anything else you want to say? 10 MR. RAMIREZ: Your Honor, just two requests on behalf 11 of my client. One, that the Court make a recommendation to the 12 Federal Bureau of Prisons that he be located at the Bastrop 13 facility. 14 THE COURT: So recommended. 15 MR. RAMIREZ: And taking into consideration he's 16 former law enforcement, that -- with respect to security 17 concerns in that regard. 18 THE COURT: All right. 19 MR. RAMIREZ: Second of all, if he may be able to 20 turn himself in at that facility once he's notified as to a date and time to turn himself in. 21 22 All right. And again, there's a health THE COURT: 23 situation that I know Mr. Padilla has. I'll allow that, to 24 avoid the problems that happen commencing the sentence here in 25 a local facility.

```
39
1
              Are there remaining counts? Have we dismissed all
 2
    the other counts as to this Defendant?
 3
              MR. STURGIS: Your Honor, I believe there's one other
 4
            The Government would move to dismiss the remaining
    count.
 5
    count.
 6
              THE COURT: All right, so ordered.
 7
              All right, Mr. Padilla, best of luck to you, sir.
 8
              THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.
 9
              THE COURT: You're excused at this time.
         (This proceeding was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION		
I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.		
Tom Movember 21, 2014_		
TONI HUDSON, TRANSCRIBER		